UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,912	03/30/2006	Seog Ho Go	9988.310.00	4350

30827 7590 10/21/2009

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER	
BROWN, VERNAL U	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2612	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/573,912	GO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VERNAL U. BROWN	2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 June 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13 and 16-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13 and 16-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to amendment filed June 23, 2009.

Response to Amendment

The examiner has acknowledged the amendment of claims 1-4, 7-13, 18, and the , cancellation of claims 14-15.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 and 16-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being by Klausner US Patent 5839097.

Regarding claim 1, Klausner teaches a remote control system for controlling multiple appliances, comprising:

a plurality of home appliances installed at a place remote from a user (col. 3 lines 56-65);

a monitoring device (17) connected to the plurality of home appliances by a cable to transmit data to the appliances (col. 4 lines 15-20);

a remote controller (26) wirelessly connected to the monitoring device and transmit data to the monitoring device for controlling the appliances (col. 5 lines 15-26);

the monitoring device processed the data received from the remote control and ensure the data reaches the intended targeted appliance and control the appliance according to the command transmitted from the remote controller (col. 5 lines 20-26).

the monitoring device is a computer and include a memory for storing data receive from the remote control (col. 5 lines 26-40).

Regarding claim 2, Klausner teaches the home appliance is a washing machine (col. 3 line 62).

Regarding claims 3-5, Klausner teaches monitoring device comprises a display for displaying an operation state of the appliance, an infrared communication module for communicating with the remote control and an input/output control unit to allow the operation state of the appliance to be displayed (col. 5 lines 16-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klausner US Patent 5839097 in view of Ioku UK Patent Application Publication 2265158.

Regarding claims 6-7, Klausner teaches a remote control for inputting command to the monitoring device and an infrared module for transmitting infrared signal (col. 5 lines 20-26) but is not explicit in teaching a plurality of buttons for inputting control command. Ioku in an analogous art teaches the remote controller comprises:

an input unit having a plurality of buttons for inputting control (page 6 lines 5-7);

an infrared communication module for transmitting data to the monitoring device and a display for displaying the operational state of the washing machine (page 6 lines 5-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify the system of Klausner as disclosed by Ioku because the remote control requires an input means for inputting command to the remote control and the plurality of keys represents a conventional means for inputting command to the remote control device.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klausner US Patent 5839097 in view of in view of Daum et al. US Paten Application Publication 20020097851.

Regarding claims 8-10, Klausner is silent on teaching a power line modem provided at the monitoring device. Daum et al. in an analogous art teaches the use of a power line modem for the transmission and reception of control signals for an appliance (paragraph 006, 022). It is also the examiner's position that the reference of Klausner teaches the appliances are connected to each other by a communication cable (10) and the reference of Daum et al. teaches the appliance is connected to the monitoring device via a power line (paragraph 006, 022) and the examiner consider the use of power line and the communication cable as a design choice.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Klausner as disclosed by Daum et al. because communicating over the power line allows connection to all the appliances connected to the power line and avoid the additional cost of installing communication medium.

Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klausner US Patent 5839097 in view of Song et al. US Patent 6889510.

Regarding claims 11-12, Klausner is silent on teaching the monitoring device is wireless connected to a communication device which is connected to a home appliance via a power line network. Song et al. in an analogous art teaches a monitoring device wirelessly connected to a communication device of refrigerator 10 and the refrigerator is connected to other appliances over a power line network (col. col. 5 lines 14-40). Song et al. also teaches the monitoring device is connected to a data processing unit (server) (col. 4 lines 10-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Klausner as disclosed by Song et al. because this allows the home network to be more flexible and provide for the connection to different interfaces.

Claims 13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. US Patent 6889510 in view of Klausner US Patent 5839097.

Regarding claims 13 and 16-17, Song et al. teaches a monitoring device (30) for monitoring an operation state of the home appliance and the monitoring device is installed remotely from the appliance (col. 3 lines 51-60) and a communication device provided by the refrigerator, having signal processing unit for exchanging data between the monitoring device,

wherein the communication device exchanges data with the monitoring device through an infrared communication module and exchange data with the appliances through a power line network (col. col. 5 lines 14-40). Song et al. is silent on teaching the monitoring device receive signal from a remote control. Klausner in an analogous art teaches a monitoring device receiving control signal from a remote control and control signal is transmitted to the appliances (col. 5 lines 20-26). Klausner teaches the appliances are connected to each other by a communication cable (10) and the reference of Song et al. teaches the appliance is connected to the monitoring device via a power line and the examiner consider the use of power line and the communication cable as a design choice.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Song et al. as disclose by Klausner because the remote control provides a means of remotely inputting control signal to the monitoring device and therefore provide a more convenient means of inputting data to the monitoring device.

Claim 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. US Patent 6889510 in view of Klausner US Patent 5839097 and further in view of Macey US Patent 20020175828.

Regarding claims 18-21, Songs et al. teaches a remote control method for home appliances comprising:

a monitoring device (30) having a display for displaying the status of a home appliance (col. 4 lines 62-67);

transmitting the operation condition received by the monitoring device to a communication device to a communication to a home network control module (18) provided by t the refrigerator (col. 4 lines 40-53);

transmitting the operation condition received by the communication device to the home appliances connected to the home network (col. 5 lines 18-26);

displaying an operation status of the appliance on the monitoring device (col. 5 lines 16-20). Song et al. is silent on teaching the monitoring device receive signal from a remote control. Klausner in an analogous art teaches a monitoring device receiving control signal from a remote control and control signal is transmitted to the appliances (col. 5 lines 20-26). Song et al. in view of Klausner is silent on teaching transmitting the operating state of the appliance to the remote control. Mace teaches a two way remote control that receive and display status information of the appliance (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Song et al. as disclose by Klausner in view of Macey because the remote control provides a means of remotely inputting control signal to the monitoring device and therefore provide a more convenient means of inputting data to the monitoring device.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VERNAL U. BROWN whose telephone number is (571)272-3060. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Zimmerman can be reached on 571-272-3059. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vernal U Brown/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2612